

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated April 11, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claim 1 is hereby amended. Claim 2 is hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No claims are added. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-4 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Office rejected claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by European Application Patent No. 120,640 to *EMI Limited* (hereinafter "*EP '640*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the MPEP, in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." Applicants respectfully submit that *EP '640* does not teach every element recited in claims 1 and 4 and therefore cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite the features of cancelled claim 2. As stated by the Office, *EP '640* fails to disclose features of claim 2. *See page 4 of Office Action*. For at least the aforementioned reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *EP '640*. Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and is therefore also patentably distinguishable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1 and 4.

The Office rejected claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *EP '640* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,949,779 to *Mostafa et al.* (hereinafter "*Mostafa*"). Claim 2 is cancelled. Accordingly, the rejection of that claim is moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 3.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the MPEP, in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." Applicants submit that neither *EP '640* nor *Mostafa* either singularly or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element recited in claim 3 at least by virtue of its dependence on

independent claim 1. Therefore, the combined teachings of *EP '640* and *Mostafa* cannot render claim 3 obvious.

The Office admits that *EP '640* does not teach “providing the serial number of the adapter to the network controller, nor specify the details description of the master controller; particularly that it is located on the Internet.” *Office Action at page 4*. The Office deals with this deficiency by alleging that *Mostafa* teaches these limitations. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As correctly pointed out in the Office Action at page 4, *EP '640* does not disclose “making access to a house code managing site on the Internet in the program, receiving an own house code assigned from the house code managing site and transferring to a relevant adapter ...” *Mostafa* is introduced to overcome the deficiencies of *EP '640*, specifically to teach “making access to a house code managing site on the Internet and receiving an own house code assigned from the house code managing site.” *Office Action at page 4*. However, in col. 8 lines 30-33, *Mostafa* discloses that the UHMN first selects a proposed house code address. Then the UHMN polls the networks linked to the BAN port to check if the first proposed house code address is already in use. In contrast, claim 3, by virtue of its dependence on claim 1, recites “receiving an own house code assigned from the house code managing site and transferring to a relevant adapter.” Clearly, the Applicants’ method of receiving a house code assigned by the house code managing site is patentably distinct from *Mostafa*’s selecting a proposed house code address and polling to check if the house code address is already in use. Because neither of the references, singularly or in combination teach all the claimed elements, the teaching of *EP '640* in view of *Mostafa* does not render claim 3 obvious.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3, by virtue of its dependence on independent claim 1, is patentably distinguishable over *EP '640* in view of *Mostafa*. Accordingly, Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 3 be withdrawn.

The application is in condition for allowance. Early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: July 10, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael L. Angert (Reg. No. 46,522)
for **Mark R. Kresloff**

Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant